

---

**CITY OF COLUMBIA**  
**DESIGN / DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMISSION**  
**JULY 12, 2012- 4:00 PM**

**Minutes**

**Eau Claire Print Building**  
**3907 Ensor Avenue • N. Main Street and Monticello Road • Columbia, SC**

---

**Members Present:** Bruce Harper, Doris Hildebrand, Betsy Kaemmerlen, Dale Marshall, David Ross, Lesesne Monteith, Catherine Horne, Dr. Leslie Skinner (arrived during Huger Street case)

**Member Absent:** Beronica Whisnant

**Staff Present:** Amy Moore, John Fellows, Jeff Crick, Lindsay Crick, Staci Richey, Jerre Threatt

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson David Ross at 4:00 PM, Roll Call – Quorum established, swearing in of applicants and public speakers.

Amy Moore, Preservation Planner, noted changes to the Agenda since publication. She proceeded with review of the Consent Agenda. Item 3 on the Regular Agenda, Historic Portion, **2918 Kershaw Street** was deferred to the August meeting.

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

**II. CONSENT AGENDA**

**URBAN**

1. **1619 Pendleton** (TMS# R11401-15-02) Request Certificate of Design Approval for signage. *Individual Landmark*
2. **3210 Kline Street** (TMS#R13901-11-03) Request Certificate of Design Approval for accessory building. *Melrose Heights/Oak Lawn Architectural Conservation District*

**Motion by Ms. Kaemmerlen to approve** the Consent Agenda with the note that though there is no purview over this, that permeable pavement be suggested to the owner to be used to the rear of the property at 3210 Kline Street; *seconded by Mr. Harper. Requests for Certificates of Design approval granted 7-0.*

**III. REGULAR AGENDA**

**URBAN**

1. **500 Huger Street & S/S Blossom Street** (TMS#08914-16-02 and 08914-16-01) Request for site plan approval for student housing. *Innovista Design District*
2. **500 Huger Street & S/S Blossom Street** (TMS# 08914-16-02 and 08914-16-01)  
Conceptual discussion for design review for student housing. *Innovista Design District*

A memo was received on provisions by the applicant regarding revisions on the number of units. This will be premier Student Housing for USC by Monarch Ventures, LLC and Arnold Companies. This facility will consist of 2 and 4 bedroom units totaling 612 beds and 199 units. There will be a total of 756 parking spots

including 154 bicycle spaces and 31 ADA accessible spaces. Guest parking, which will be angled or perpendicular, will be on Wheat Street; as well as additional parking as not all student parking spaces will be utilized at all times. Units will be fully furnished and utilities included with pedestrian walkways around the buildings. There will be setbacks off Blossom Street to allow for benches and landscaping, and additional lighting. Amenities provided will be gathering areas, study areas, roof top pool and gym facility. This project should be completed by 2014.

Comments from city staff noted with numerous conditions noted. The Planning Department recommends deferral due to seven issues they feel need to be addressed, as well as some issues of concern by the Zoning Administrator. Amended plans were submitted today.

Mike Chatham, Monarch Ventures, LLC, presented on the proposed student housing project. Each unit will have a bed and bath. Each student must sign own lease. Many amenities and activities are available. There will be an interior parking deck surrounded by the buildings.

Samples of brick and colors were provided. Two colors of brick will be used, one will be smooth and the other will be cut brick. Accents will match the brick. The main color will be a pale color, and additional color can be added. The building will be brick and hardi; with the upper floors being all hardi giving more of a board and batten look. The project will be seven stories high with a rooftop pool, study and gathering areas.

Mr. Ross suggested, for efficiency, that as many comments be given today so when the application presents again, they will be answered. Ms. Kaemmerlen requested a grading plan for the Blossom/Pulaski Streets corner be prepared for review.

Commission members voiced concerns regarding safety traveling to and from units. A traffic impact study, as well as a bicycle and pedestrian study, has been requested by the City of Columbia Traffic Engineer. Pedestrian circulation and routes of travel were discussed. A detailed design for review will be brought for review by the Commission.

Mark Cotterill, Grimball Cotterill, discussed landscape and treescape issues.

Mr. Marshall stated the biggest challenge is where the building fronts the parking garage. There must be entry articulation for those to enter the building from the pedestrian level and not from the garage. He voiced some issues with overall massing. Mr. Ross suggested an entrance at the corner of Blossom and Huger Streets. Elevators and stairs will be located at the points of the garage. There will be a landscape wall and hallway area between the parking garage and units. There will be a retail store for residents exclusively.

Commissioner members requested a more complex plan to be reviewed with staff, then brought back to August D/DRC meeting.

Joe Weider, Granby Hill Alliance, voiced concerns with connectivity issues; vehicular issues and pedestrian issues. Commission members felt the traffic study will take pedestrian access into account as well.

**Motion by Mr. Marshall to defer 500 Huger Street & S/S Blossom Street request for site plan approval for student housing and conceptual discussion for design review for student housing to the August 9<sup>th</sup>, D/DRC meeting; seconded by Ms. Kaemmerlen. Motion to defer granted 8-0.**

#### **HISTORIC**

1. **14 Myrtle Court (TMS# 11307-07-22) Request for Certificate of Design Approval for exterior changes. Wales Garden Architectural Conservation District.**

Single family residential home built in 1932, strong Craftsman architectural influences. The house has had some alterations in the past, and the homeowners want to do additional renovations to include moving the entry, and changing some vents into windows to utilize the upstairs portion. The most significant changes will be made to the right side of the house. The house was originally built as a single-family residence and converted into a duplex at some point. A permit for "removing a non-load bearing interior wall" was issued however work being done was well beyond the scope of the permit. Staff is concerned with retaining the historical character of the home while allowing the changes.

Erin Hope, homeowner, stated some changes were done without knowledge of what changes could be made. The front door is to be relocated to give a nice sense of entry and the current door location will be re-bricked. As there are two driveways on the house, it hard to determine where to enter the home. The owners would like to remove vents from the front of the house to allow more light and give a natural appearance, and want to add a casement window to maintain the look of the home. Ms. Hope voiced opposition to staff comments to retain the side entry door with the window, asking for Commission comments/suggestions. As staff indicated in the evaluation, the side entry door is not historic but the wood window is. They would like to put French doors in to make things more symmetrical. A brick wall will be brought to the front to allow for more courtyard space and rebuilt as a brick lattice wall.

Mr. Marshall stated two issues were noted in staff recommendations: replacement with French doors and windows on the front. There have clearly been significant renovations in the past to change the nature of the house. The window appears to be original and it has to be determined if it should be kept.

Staff felt the windows are original to the house and it would be a loss of historic fabric if the door and windows are removed; objecting to the three transom windows and recommending one. Ms. Moore asked the D/DRC be specific in the type of window that should be used when making a motion. The side porch was an open porch that was later boarded up and never had a window there. Dr. Skinner felt a window of any type should not be introduced.

**Motion by Ms. Kaemmerlen to approve** the request for a Certificate of Design Approval for 14 Myrtle Court for exterior changes with the following conditions: eliminating the need for exterior shutters in the attic vents that will be converted into windows, the louvers may be removed but retain the framing and the gable window; allow the front door to be installed due to previous alterations affecting the entry; and allow the installation of French doors, and decision regarding bathroom windows up to staff; that the transom windows not be allowed but a more traditional configuration of bathroom window be used; *seconded by Ms. Skinner. Request granted 8-0.*

**2. 2130 Senate Street (TMS#R11406-11-10) Request for Certificate of Design Approval for new construction. *Old Shandon/Lower Waverly Protection Area***

Application presented at the June D/DRC meeting; applicant is proposing changes to the previously approved project. Staff cannot recommend approval for a front dormer and dormer on the back because of their configuration. The applicant proposes to move the front dormer down but retain the shed roof configuration and make the rear area more of a second-story wall.

Malcolm Harris, homeowner, stated changes are needed to allow more wall space for the back of the residence. He agreed with staff to retain the gable dormer on the front which will be in keeping with the neighborhood. The rear area can be worked out with staff.

**Motion by Mr. Marshall to grant** a Certificate of Design Approval for 2130 Senate Street for modification to the rear dormer to be a shed-shape dormer with the size determined by the applicant; and the front dormer be modified to be a gable dormer; *seconded by Ms. Kaemmerlen. Request granted 8-0.*

3. **2918 Kershaw Street** (TMS# R13902-14-04) Request for Certificate of Design Approval for exterior changes. *Melrose Heights/Oak Lawn Architectural Conservation District.*  
*Deferred to August meeting*

4. **3016 Prentice Street** (TMS#11313-08-08) Request for Certificate of Design Approval for demolition. *Rosewood Community Character*

Demolition relocations are reviewed out of the community character areas. On structures that are 50 years or older, contributing/or possibly contributing, must present to the D/DRC for review. This is a one-story wood house in moderate condition that has seen some alterations. Most of the massing has remained, as well as the original 2/2 wood windows. Applicants own the house next door and request approval for demolition to make more room for their other home. Request is for demolition only and new construction will not be reviewed. Homeowner, Tina Rankin, was available for questions.

**Motion by Mr. Monteith to approve** the request for Certificate of Design approval for demolition at **3016 Prentice Street**, *seconded by Ms. Kaemmerlen.*

*Motion by Mr. Marshall to amend the motion as made to include additional language explaining justification*

**Motion by Mr. Monteith to approve** the request for Certificate of Design approval for demolition at **3016 Prentice Street** subject to staff recommendations; *seconded by Ms. Kaemmerlen.*

**Motion to amend granted 8-0.**

**Request granted on the amended motion 8-0.**

Ms. Moore added for clarification that in the Rosewood area or other similar areas [community character areas], the Zoning Department will be responsible for looking at basic massing, setbacks, and height for new construction on newly subdivided lots.

#### **IV. OTHER BUSINESS**

#### **V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES** June

**Motion to approve the June 14, 2012 minutes by Mr. Harper; seconded by Ms. Hildebrand. Minutes approved 8-0.**

#### **VI. ADJOURN**

**There being no further business, there was a motion to adjourn by Mr. Harper; seconded by Mr. Marshall. Request granted 8-0. Meeting adjourned at 5:30 PM**

  
Chairperson

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Respectfully submitted by Andrea Wolfe  
Sr. Admin. Secretary  
Planning and Development Services Department